UNITED NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/AC.51/1991/2
2 April 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME AND
COORDINATION
Thirty-first session
13 May-7 June 1991
Item 3 (d) of the provisional agenda*

PROGRAMME QUESTIONS: EVALUATION

In-depth evaluation of the disarmament programme

Report of the Secretary-General

SUMMARY

At its thirtieth session the Committee for Programme and Coordination considered the follow-up report of the Secretary-General on the in-depth evaluation of the disarmament programme (E/AC.51/1990/3 and Corr.1). The present report has been prepared in accordance with the Committee's decisions at that session on the issues to be addressed and methodology to be followed (A/45/16, part one, paras. 358-361). The evaluation found the pre-session and in-session servicing of the First Committee and the Conference on Disarmament by the Department for Disarmament Affairs to be well regarded by Member States. The Disarmament Yearbook and the Disarmament periodical appear to be meeting the needs of government agencies; professionals in academic or research institutes and non-governmental organizations, while generally positive, were less so than government agencies. Correspondents rated the overall quality of the assistance they received from the Department for Disarmament Affairs favourably. The World Disarmament Campaign, however, was not considered by the majority of these correspondents to be effective. The fellowship programme has contributed to the work of government departments dealing with disarmament matters. Recommendations have been made in the report on the World Disarmament Campaign concerning feedback mechanisms, publications, the number of fellowships and several other issues.

* E/AC.51/1991/1.

91-10599 2349j (E)

/...

READEX FICHE

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
INTRODUCTION	1 - 9	5
A. General	1 - 7	5
B. Methodology	8 - 9	7
I. DELIBERATIONS AND NEGOTIATION (SUBPROGRAMME 1)	10 - 27	7
A. Preliminary observations	10	7
B. Methodology	11 - 13	7
C. Adequacy of preparatory activities	14 - 15	8
1. First Committee	14	8
2. Conference on Disarmament	15	8
D. Substantive contribution of the Secretariat and follow-up activities	15 - 20	8
1. First Committee	16 - 18	8
2. Conference on Disarmament	19 - 20	9
E. Promotion of signature and ratification of multilateral agreements	21	9
F. Role of non-governmental organizations	22 - 27	12
1. Preliminary observations	22 - 23	12
2. First Committee	24	12
3. Conference on Disarmament	25 - 27	13
II. INFORMATION, STUDIES AND THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CAMPAIGN (SUBPROGRAMMES 2, 3 and 5)	28 - 59	13
A. Objectives and activities	28	13
B. Methodology	29 - 31	13
C. Preliminary observations	32 - 35	14

CONTENTS (continued)

		Paragraphs	Page
D.	Adequacy of activities	36 - 45	16
	1. Major publications	36 - 38	16
	2. Press coverage	39 - 40	16
	3. World Disarmament Campaign	41 - 45	17
E.	Usefulness of output	46 - 58	18
	1. Major publications	46 - 55	18
	2. Press coverage	56 - 58	21
F.	Adequacy of feedback mechanisms	59	21
III.	FELLOWSHIPS, TRAINING AND ADVISORY SERVICES (SUBPROGRAMME 4)	60 - 71	22
A.	Objectives and activities	60 - 61	22
B.	Methodology	62 - 63	22
C.	Adequacy of training programmes	64 - 67	22
	1. Sponsoring Governments	64	22
	2. Fellowship holders	65 - 67	23
D.	Extent to which training is applied	68 - 70	23
	1. Sponsoring Governments	68	23
	2. Fellowship holders	69 - 70	23
E.	Capacity of Secretariat to meet needs	71	24
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	72 - 82	24
A.	Conclusions	72 - 76	24
B.	Recommendations	77 - 82	25

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Annexes

I. Results of questionnaire survey of members of the First Committee 27

II. Results of questionnaire survey of members of the Conference on Disarmament 29

III. Results of questionnaire survey of subscribers to the Disarmament Yearbook and the Disarmament periodical 31

IV. Results of questionnaire survey of United Nations correspondents . 36

V. Results of questionnaire survey of Governments sponsoring fellowship holders 39

VI. Results of questionnaire survey of fellowship holders 42

INTRODUCTION

A. General

1. The Charter of the United Nations envisages disarmament and the regulation of armaments as elements in the establishment of an international security system. The multilateral machinery through which disarmament issues are considered includes the following bodies: the General Assembly (including the First Committee and special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament), the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, with the Department for Disarmament Affairs providing secretariat services for these bodies. The activities of the principal disarmament bodies are described in detail in the Disarmament Yearbook, vol. XIV, 1989. 1/

2. The General Assembly is a permanent forum for disarmament deliberations and the main source of initiatives and recommendations by the international community on the whole spectrum of disarmament-related issues. The First Committee of the General Assembly deals only with disarmament and related international security questions. It approves relevant draft resolutions and recommends them to the Assembly for adoption. In 1978, 1982 and 1988 the General Assembly convened special sessions devoted entirely to the question of disarmament. At the 1982 special session the World Disarmament Campaign was launched.

3. The Disarmament Commission provides a subsidiary forum for deliberation on disarmament issues when the Assembly is not in session; a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, its function is to consider and make recommendations on various problems in the field of disarmament and to follow up the relevant decisions and recommendations of the special session. The Commission reports annually to the General Assembly.

4. The Conference on Disarmament is the single multilateral negotiating forum of the international community on arms limitation and disarmament. Its role is to negotiate arms limitation and disarmament agreements of a universal character. The Conference adopts its own agenda and programme of work each year, taking into consideration the recommendations of the General Assembly. The Conference is not a deliberative organ. It functions according to its own rules of procedure, which provide for the adoption of all decisions, whether procedural or substantive, by consensus only. The presidency of the Conference rotates among its members on a monthly basis. The Conference holds plenary as well as informal meetings and in order to discharge its functions sets up subsidiary bodies (at present, five ad hoc committees) to deal with the substantive items on its agenda.

5. The rules of procedure of the Conference do not provide for the post of rapporteur, for either the Conference itself or its subsidiary bodies. This role is performed by the substantive secretariat of the Conference, which prepares a draft report for the consideration of, and adoption by, the Conference and subsequent presentation to the General Assembly. Besides

providing organizational, substantive and administrative support to the Conference and its subsidiary bodies, preparing documentation presented by Governments and advising successive presidents of the Conference as well as chairmen of subsidiary bodies on the conduct of their work, the staff assigned to the Conference is responsible for the maintenance of official records, including verbatim records of proceedings.

6. The Department for Disarmament Affairs provides secretariat and administrative services related to the planning, organization and conduct of meetings as well as substantive services that include, inter alia, preparation and coordination of reports, informal working papers and background information, as well as legal and technical advice and assistance in facilitating the deliberative and negotiating process and in drafting articles of agreement on declarations, suggestions and approaches or solutions to problems and assisting consultations. Secretariat activities during the implementation period consist of following up General Assembly resolutions and decisions and monitoring and promoting the signature and ratification of agreements.

7. Resource allocation through the disarmament machinery described above is shown in table 1.

Table 1. Disarmament programme: regular budget (RB) and extrabudgetary (XB) allocations, 1988-1991

(Thousands of United States dollars)

Organizational entity	1988-1989 a/ RB	1988-1989 a/ XB	1990-1991 a/ RB	1990-1991 a/ XB	Total RB	Total XB
A. Policy-making organs						
(a) Special session of the General Assembly b/	5 252.6	-	-	-	5 252.6	-
(b) Conference on Disarmament	445.3	-	448.4	-	893.7	-
B. Department for Disarmament Affairs	10 247.6	5 093.1	10 706.4	5 428.0	20 954.0	10 521.1
Total	15 945.5	5 093.1	11 154.8	5 428.0	27 100.3	10 521.1

a/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 6, A/44/6/Rev.1, vol. I, tables 2B.1 and 2B.4.

b/ E/AC.51/1989/5, table 1.

B. Methodology

8. At its twenty-ninth session, the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) considered the progress report of the Secretary-General on the in-depth evaluation of the disarmament programme (E/AC.51/1989/5). The Committee requested the Secretary-General to present to it at its thirtieth session a revised proposal on the methodology and scheduling of the evaluation of the disarmament programme, including methodological considerations that could be applied in the evaluation of other political programmes. 2/

9. At its thirtieth session the Committee considered the follow-up report of the Secretary-General on the in-depth evaluation of the disarmament programme (E/AC.51/1990/3 and Corr.1). The Committee felt that option A of paragraph 60 of the follow-up report should be adopted and any questionnaires based on the issues noted in annex I thereof should be restricted to items 1 (a) and (b), 3 (a), 4 and 5. The Committee also endorsed the issues to be addressed that were presented in paragraphs 23, 33 and 38, the methods of data collection proposed in paragraphs 23, 34 to 36 and 39 to 41 and the recommendation contained in paragraphs 42 to 46 of the follow-up report. The present report has been prepared in accordance with the decisions of the Committee. 3/

I. DELIBERATIONS AND NEGOTIATION (SUBPROGRAMME 1)

A. Preliminary observations

10. In his 1990 report on the Work of the Organization, the Secretary-General assessed the world disarmament situation as follows:

> "A new security situation is being shaped at the global level by the rapid improvements in the relationship between East and West. Measures of disarmament, a long-sought goal of the international community, have finally moved into the realm of the possible.
>
> "... The significance of the current process goes far beyond the sheer numbers of arms and armed forces involved. It is now widely recognized that the process of creating a system of confidence-building measures is indispensable in removing the mistrust and misjudgements that have been the root causes of the arms race. This recognition has given new meaning to, and validated, the principle of seeking undiminished security at progressively lower levels of armaments and armed forces." 4/

B. Methodology

11. The issues addressed were (a) the adequacy of preparatory activities to meet the needs of Governments, (b) the usefulness and effectiveness of the Secretariat's substantive contribution during the deliberation or negotiation process, (c) the adequacy of follow-up activities to meet the needs of Governments, and (d) the adequacy and effectiveness of the Secretariat's

assistance in promoting the signature and ratification of multilateral disarmament agreements and in monitoring those agreements.

12. Questionnaires were submitted to all members of the General Assembly's First Committee, which includes the members of the Disarmament Commission, and to members of the Conference on Disarmament in order to assess the effectiveness of the Secretariat's activities and to solicit recommendations for strengthening the Secretariat's role in assisting in the deliberations and negotiations of these bodies. The check-list for these questionnaires followed the issues that were approved by CPC at its thirtieth session. Data concerning the signature and ratification of multilateral disarmament agreements were obtained from documentation review. Annexes I and II give the detailed results of the survey.

13. The overall response rate was 30 per cent for the First Committee, 50 per cent for member States of CPC at its thirtieth session. For the Conference on Disarmament the overall response rate was 23 per cent.

C. Adequacy of preparatory activities

1. First Committee

14. In general terms, the activities of the Department for Disarmament Affairs received almost unanimous approval. One hundred per cent of respondents considered "planning and organizational arrangements" to have been satisfactory and a slightly lower proportion considered that the "timely processing of documentation" had been satisfactory.

2. Conference on Disarmament

15. Almost 90 per cent of members of the Conference on Disarmament who responded to the questionnaire considered the "timely processing of documentation" and "planning and organizational arrangements" to have been satisfactory.

D. Substantive contribution of the Secretariat and follow-up activities

1. First Committee

16. The substantive contributions of the Secretariat to pre- and in-session servicing of the First Committee received almost unanimous approval by questionnaire respondents. However, 25 per cent of respondents did not consider the preparation and issuance of in-session documents by the Department to have been timely.

17. The rate of positive response was on the average about 10 per cent lower for in-session, as compared with pre-session, servicing. A small number of respondents answered "not applicable" to questions concerning the provision of substantive advice as well as other aspects of in-session servicing of meetings. There appears to be some need for informal clarification of the role of the Secretariat. Perhaps a round-table discussion would be an appropriate forum for such clarification.

18. Almost all respondents considered that the Department had been effective or very effective in follow-up action required by relevant decisions and recommendations. However, it should be noted that over 50 per cent of respondents chose to give the second highest, but not the highest, rating to the Department for effectiveness of its follow-up activities.

2. Conference on Disarmament

19. For historical background, objective presentation of information and overall usefulness of its pre-session information and documentation, as required by members of the Conference, the Department received positive responses from almost 90 per cent of respondents, although somewhat fewer respondents considered that issues had been well clarified and that the analysis was sound in that information and documentation.

20. Members of the Conference expressed virtually unanimous satisfaction with all aspects of in-session servicing by the Secretariat.

E. Promotion of signature and ratification of multilateral agreements

21. The significance of the United Nations disarmament programme as a forum for negotiation on disarmament has already been discussed in the 1989 progress report of the Secretary-General (E/AC.51/1989/5, paras. 11-13). In the last two years the Secretariat has continued to monitor and promote the signature and ratification of multilateral agreements. The increase in the number of parties to multilateral arms regulation and disarmament agreements is shown in table 2.

Table 2. Status of multilateral arms regulations and disarmament agreements

Agreement	Date of entry into force	Number of parties 1986	1987	1988	1989
Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use of War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare	a/	110	110	112	122
Antarctic Treaty	23 June 1961	33	37	38	39
Treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water	10 October 1963	115	115	117	118
Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies	10 October 1967	87	87	87	91
Treaty for the prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)	b/	31	31	31	31
Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons	5 March 1970	136	137	139	141
Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil thereof	18 May 1972	77	79	81	82
Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction	26 March 1975	107	109	110	111
Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques	5 October 1978	51	52	55	55

Table 2 (continued)

Agreement	Date of entry into force	Number of parties 1986	1987	1988	1989
Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies	11 July 1984	7	7	7	7
Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects	2 December 1983	25	28	30	32
South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Rarotonga)	11 December 1986	8	9	11	13

Source: Disarmament Yearbook, vols. X-XIV, 1986-1989, appendix 1.

a/ For each signatory, from the date of deposit of its ratification. Adopted 17 June 1925.

b/ Individually, for each signatory. Open for signature 14 February 1967.

F. Role of non-governmental organizations

1. Preliminary observations

22. The Department for Disarmament Affairs maintains close contact and cooperation with individual non-governmental organizations around the world, as well as with the NGO Committee on Disarmament, in New York, and the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament, in Geneva. In order to meet the special needs of the non-governmental organization community the Department produces and disseminates, as part of its publication programme, the Disarmament Newsletter and the Disarmament Facts series. Every year the NGO Committee on Disarmament cooperates with the Department in organizing two non-governmental organization forums on disarmament-related issues, one during the regular session of the Disarmament Commission, in May, and the other during Disarmament Week, in October. Both forums have always been well attended, with between 140 and 150 non-governmental organization representatives participating. Each year the Department publishes excerpts from the forum held in May. Three such publications, under the title Disarmament Possibilities, have been issued in 1988, 1989 and 1990. Similarly, the Department's Geneva branch cooperates with the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament in organizing forums during sessions of the Conference on Disarmament.

23. The Department also facilities the participation of non-governmental organizations in United Nations disarmament conferences as well as in other international disarmament conferences that are serviced by the United Nations Secretariat. For example, at the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in Geneva from 20 August to 14 September 1990, briefings and other facilities, including the provision of specially prepared publications, access to Conference documentation and a display of non-governmental organization materials, were made available to 44 attending organizations represented by 70 individuals. Over 200 non-governmental organization representatives took part in the Amendment Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, held in New York from 7 to 18 January 1991. Pursuant to a decision made by the Amendment Conference at its organizational meeting, an informal meeting was held so that statements from non-governmental organizations could be heard. As in the past, the Department assumed responsibility for registration of non-governmental organizations as well as for the provision of various facilities to assist them in following the deliberations of the Conference.

2. First Committee

24. Respondents believed that the participation of non-governmental organizations affected the outcome of meetings but that the role of those organizations was perceived differently at United Nations Headquarters than in their nation's capital. Seventy per cent of respondents considered that non-governmental organizations were viewed as "fairly important" or "very important" at United Nations Headquarters, but only 50 per cent consider that

such ratings would be given in their capital. When considering the importance given to the role of non-governmental organizations in their capital, almost 50 per cent of respondents selected a rating of "not important" or "not applicable"; only 30 per cent selected those ratings for Headquarters.

3. Conference on Disarmament

25. Over 55 per cent of members of the Conference on Disarmament who responded believed that at the Conference venue the role of non-governmental organizations had been perceived to be a factor "fairly important" to the outcome of the meetings; no respondents assigned a highest rating of "very important". Over 40 per cent gave assessments of "not important" or "not applicable" to the perceived role, at the Conference venue, of non-governmental organizations.

26. In contrast, 22 per cent of respondents assigned the highest rating to the perception in their capital of the importance of the role of non-governmental organizations; another 44 per cent of respondents characterized the perception of that role in their capital as "fairly important".

27. Informal meetings between delegations and representatives of non-governmental organizations located in New York and Geneva might be useful for discussing the apparent assessment disparities mentioned above and for exploring ways to enhance the actual as well as the perceived contributions of non-governmental organizations.

II. INFORMATION, STUDIES AND THE WORLD DISARMAMENT CAMPAIGN (SUBPROGRAMMES 2, 3 AND 5)

A. Objectives and activities

28. The objectives and activities of the information and studies programmes and of the World Disarmament Campaign have been described in both the progress report (E/AC.51/1989/5, paras. 16-18) and the follow-up report (E/AC.51/1990/3 and Corr.1, paras. 24-32) of the Secretary-General on in-depth evaluation of the disarmament programme.

B. Methodology

29. The issues addressed were (a) the adequacy of the design of activities proposed in the medium-term plan and programme budget in relation to the objectives of the subprogrammes; (b) the extent to which the output achieved required objectives of providing useful information to end users on United Nations and other arms limitation and disarmament activities; (c) the adequacy of feedback mechanisms; and (d) the ways in which implementation of the three subprogrammes might be improved and monitoring and evaluation of activities facilitated.

30. The Disarmament Yearbook is intended primarily as a reference work for government and other specialists. Although distributed free of charge to Governments, it is also a sales publication; its free mailing-list distribution is therefore limited (2,800). The periodical Disarmament is a specialized journal aimed at those who focus in depth on questions related to arms limitation, disarmament and security. Since it is both a sales and a subscription item Disarmament's free distribution by mail is similarly limited. Questionnaires were sent to a sample of organizations and persons whose names appeared on the mailing list of the Department for Disarmament Affairs to elicit their opinion of the usefulness and effectiveness of these two major recurrent publications. The response rate was 20 per cent, and separate analyses were made of the responses by government agencies, academic or research institutions and non-governmental organizations.

31. Questionnaires were also sent to accredited United Nations correspondents in order to elicit their opinion of the programme. Annexes III and IV give the detailed results of these surveys.

C. Preliminary observations

32. The progress report (E/AC.51/1989/5, paras. 23-25 and table 8) presented the results of a computer survey of approximately 1.3 million wire service stories for the year 1987. Approximately 2 per cent of those stories contained at least one reference to the United Nations. Against this standard, the proportion of stories on disarmament with at least one reference to the United Nations was high, over eight times that of all stories containing at least one reference to the United Nations as a whole. Analogous statistics from the same database were reviewed in a more comprehensive manner for the present report.

33. As table 3 shows, during the period 1987-1990 there was an increase in the number of stories that referred to the United Nations and an opposite trend of decrease in the number of stories on disarmament. However, the decline in the number of stories on disarmament with at least one reference to the United Nations was considerably less than that in all stories on disarmament, so that the proportion of stories on disarmament with references to the United Nations increased significantly during the 1987-1990 period.

34. Neither the nature nor the level of United Nations work on disarmament changed drastically during the 1987-1990 period. The above data suggest, therefore, that press coverage of disarmament issues in general and of United Nations work on disarmament in particular was determined by factors other than the information activities of the Secretariat.

Table 3. Wire service coverage of disarmament, 1987-1990

	Stories on disarmament				All stories			
	1987	1988	1989	1990	1987	1988	1989	1990
Stories with at least one reference to the United Nations	1 359	1 967	1 032	1 002	27 022	39 985	32 176	43 469
Total stories	8 265	6 367	4 745	3 574	1.34 million	1.34 million	1.34 million	1.60 million
Proportion with United Nations reference (percentage)	16.4	30.9	21.9	28.0	2.0	3.0	2.4	2.7

Source: NEXIS (Dag Hammarskjöld Library) WIRES file: a computer file containing the full texts of all stories filed by 20 wire services, including AP, ASAHI, Inter-Press Service, JIJI, KYODO, Reuters, TASS, UPI, Xinhua.

/...

35. The progress report of the Secretary-General also examined the references to United Nations documents and activities in professional social science literature. Despite the predominance of academic figures and non-governmental organizations on the mailing lists of the Department's major publications as well as among respondents to the questionnaires on those publications, updated findings using the same databases indicated that there had still been little use made of United Nations publications among professionals in the fields of arms control, arms limitations and disarmament. Such findings are of some significance since they concern two of the Department's major constituencies.

D. Adequacy of activities

1. Major publications

36. Over 65 per cent of respondents belonged to academic or research institutions and another 14 per cent to non-governmental organizations. Government agencies constituted only 10 per cent of respondents.

37. Approximately 80 per cent of respondents answered yes to the question "Do you wish to continue receiving the Yearbook?" About the same proportion wished to continue receiving the Disarmament periodical. Since these respondents were randomly selected from the Department's large mailing list - 6,413 entries as of 20 July 1990, some review of the list might be useful in view of the negative response from the remaining 20 per cent. It is also pertinent to note in this connection that of the nine former fellowship holders who responded to the questionnaire, only four said that they had been receiving publications issued by the Department. The five respondents who had not been receiving publications said that they wished their names to be placed on the mailing list.

38. All seven respondents from government agencies expressed the wish to continue receiving both publications.

2. Press coverage

39. Approximately half of the 13 respondents considered that United Nations activities in the field of disarmament were "of general interest".

40. With regard to such activities, the main area of interest among these New York-based respondents was meetings of the First Committee. Although Conference on Disarmament meetings took place in Geneva, they were considered by 30 per cent of New York-based respondents to be a "main area of interest". Meetings held by the Disarmament Commission and by preparatory committees received lower ratings. In terms of subject-matter, over 50 per cent of respondents had filed stories on the "cessation of all nuclear test explosions" or "disarmament and development". Subjects with the smallest number of respondents who filed stories were those dealing with "prevention of an arms race in outer space" and "naval armaments and disarmament".

3. World Disarmament Campaign

41. The World Disarmament Campaign, launched by the General Assembly in 1982, is a global information programme on issues of arms limitation, disarmament and international security. The response to questions on the effectiveness of the World Disarmament Campaign was negative. Approximately 50 per cent of respondents said that the activities of the World Disarmament Campaign had not been effective in providing them with "information on multilateral matters" or in "promoting public interest in arms limitation and disarmament". An additional 30 to 40 per cent chose not to answer these questions. Only 15 per cent answered positively. Structured interviews with respondents indicated that those who had chosen not to answer these questions on the form nevertheless had negative opinions. Some said that the World Disarmament Campaign's problem was dual: on the one hand, it had not reached many people; on the other, even people who had been reached felt that the Campaign had not been successful. These interviewees were consequently pessimistic about its practical results. Others stated that they had not been aware a campaign had been taking place.

42. In its response to the First Committee questionnaire, one delegation stated that the United Nations should "stop spending money on outdated concepts such as the World Disarmament Campaign".

43. Since these results were based on only a small sample, they are no more than suggestive of problems. In this connection, however, it is pertinent to recall the observation in paragraph 34 that the activities of the Secretariat are probably not a major factor in determining the extent of press coverage of disarmament issues.

44. At its forty-fourth session, in resolution 44/117 A, paragraph 9, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to assess the achievements and shortcomings of the World Disarmament Campaign thus far and to submit a brief report in that regard to the Assembly at its forty-fifth session. In response to that request, the Secretary-General prepared a report that stated that "the various activities [of the Campaign] were developed and/or intensified with the limited funds available in order to carry out the mandate given by the General Assembly. In addition to expanding the disarmament publications programme, the Campaign has become the focal point for requests and inquiries from the public, non-governmental organizations, libraries and educational institutions" (A/45/555 and Corr.1, para. 87). The same report also stated that "although the efforts to maximize the impact and scope have been relatively successful when measured against the limited resources made available, the severe financial constraints imposed on the Campaign have nevertheless considerably hampered its ability to reach a larger audience" (A/45/555 and Corr.1, para. 88).

45. In resolution 45/59 C, the General Assembly welcomed the assessment of the report of the Secretary-General on the World Disarmament Campaign and its achievements and shortcomings and requested the Secretary-General to submit to the Assembly at its forty-sixth session a report "covering both the

implementation of the programme of activities of the Campaign by the United Nations system during 1991 and the programme of activities contemplated by the system for 1992".

E. Usefulness of output

1. Major publications

46. Approximately 80 per cent of respondents agreed that the Disarmament Yearbook and the Disarmament periodical had achieved their stated purposes and were essential for any collection of literature on disarmament issues. Three quarters of respondents stated that their copies of these publications had been seen by others in their organizations. Approximately 40 per cent of respondents stated that they had distributed the publications in a systematic manner and a comparable proportion stated that they had recommeneded those publications to others.

47. What information do readers look for in the Disarmament Yearbook? More than 50 per cent of respondents looked for the following types of information: (a) overviews of activities related to arms limitation and disarmament in a multilateral framework, (b) emerging trends and developments, (c) texts of General Assembly resolutions and (d) texts of treaties.

48. As table 4 shows, there were significant differences among user groups with respect to their assessment of the Yearbook. The seven government agencies that responded to the questionnaire generally gave higher ratings to the Yearbook than academic or research institutions and non-governmental organizations and had somewhat different preferences among types of information. For example, whereas the rating of information dealing with "official views of particular Member States" and "historical perspectives on issues before the United Nations" was about 45 per cent among academics and non-governmental organizations, the government assessment of these issues was almost twice as high. The seven responding government agencies also rated information on "emerging trends and developments", "voting patterns" and the "status of multilateral arms regulations" considerably higher than academics and non-governmental organizations. The type of information that elicited the least overall interest was "sponsorship of resolutions", which was given the lowest rating, less than 30 per cent, by all three categories of users.

49. The large disparities between the highest and lowest responses within each constituency, as well as between constituencies, indicate that each has well-defined and distinct interests. Consequently:

(a) It is desirable to continue and to perhaps reinforce the strategy of separate publications and activities for each constituency;

(b) It is likely to be useful periodically, through questionnaires and interviews, to solicit reactions and suggestions from each constituency separately.

Table 4. Disarmament Yearbook: interest in types of information, by constituency

(Percentage)

Type of information	Government agency	Academic or research institution	Non-governmental organization
Overview of activities related to arms limitation and disarmament in a multilateral framework (General Assembly, Conference on Disarmament, International Atomic Energy Agency)	71.9	68.1	80.0
Official views of particular Member States on various issues	85.7	38.3	50.0
Emerging trends and developments	85.7	68.1	40.0
Historical perspective on issues before the United Nations	85.7	46.8	40.0
Data:			
Sponsorship of resolutions	28.6	23.4	20.0
Voting patterns	57.1	31.9	40.0
Status of multilateral arms regulations and disarmament agreements	71.4	44.7	50.0
Other	28.6	4.3	20.0
Texts:			
General Assembly resolutions	71.4	53.2	50.0
Treaties	71.4	55.3	70.0
Concluding documents of special meetings and review conferences	42.9	44.7	40.0
Other	14.3	--	10.0

Source: Internal records used as basis of annex II, question 7.

50. In the case of the Disarmament periodical, the differentiation among categories of information was not as great as that for the Yearbook. The most sought-after information comprised signed articles discussing "security and arms limitation and disarmament issues from a wider range of geopolitical perspectives than in most media" and material on "emerging trends and developments", as well as the chronicle of disarmament events, which had ratings of 55 per cent to 60 per cent. Texts of "joint statements" and "declarations" had the lowest ratings, less than 40 per cent.

51. As with the Yearbook, differentiation among categories by users of the Disarmament periodical was significant. The seven responding government agencies gave the periodical consistently higher ratings than academics and non-governmental organizations. The chronicle of disarmament events was given much higher ratings by government agencies than by non-governmental organizations and academic or research institutions. Government agencies were also more interested than the other two constituencies in texts of resolutions, treaties and concluding documents.

52. Over 70 per cent of respondents considered the Disarmament Yearbook of interest as "authoritative source material", with slightly lower positive ratings for its relevance as "background material for teaching and research" and "help in broadening the understanding of a range of views on a given issue". The overall ratings given for the Disarmament periodical were lower in all three categories, with the highest rating given to its use as background material.

53. Over one half of respondents stated that they used the Disarmament Yearbook and the Disarmament periodical for general background reference. About one quarter of respondents indicated they had cited the publications in an article or study.

54. If these small samples reflect the broader reality, government agencies seem about twice as likely as their counterparts in academic research institutions or non-governmental organizations to cite or use the two publications as reference sources.

55. In comparison with "other publications you receive regularly or read on disarmament issues", most features of the two United Nations publications were rated "very good" by about one third of respondents and "adequate" by another third; the remaining third comprised those who either did not respond or gave the rating "inadequate". The publications received the lowest rating for "timeliness of receipt".

2. Press coverage

56. The publication most widely known to correspondents responding to the questionnaire was the Disarmament Yearbook, with which seven correspondents stated that they had been familiar. Of those seven only four stated that they had utilized the Yearbook. The Disarmament periodical and Disarmament Facts had been known to only four respondents and utilized, respectively, only by two and by one. In contrast, the Newsletter had been utilized by all six of the respondents who stated that they had known of it.

57. Most respondents chose not to answer the question comparing United Nations publications with "other publications on disarmament you might use for your work". Those who chose to answer gave highest ratings to "overall quality" and "objectivity/balance". The publications received lowest ratings for "timeliness of receipt" and "readability".

58. The overall quality of the assistance received from the Department for Disarmament Affairs was rated quite favourably, with 60 per cent of respondents assessing this assistance as either "good" or "excellent". None rated it "poor". Almost 40 per cent stated that they "have not sought assistance from the Department" and, in one case, did not answer this question. Structured interviews elicited the suggestions and opinions summarized in annex IV, questions 9, 11 and 12.

F. Adequacy of feedback mechanisms

59. The Department for Disarmament Affairs has on occasion sought feedback from its World Disarmament Campaign constituencies by sending out questionnaires, most recently in 1988, and by inviting oral comments at meetings with individuals. Apart from this the Department has not been in a position to utilize formal feedback mechanisms such as questionnaires, interviews and regular reviews of information in standard databases as part of its information activities. The evidence presented above seems, in the main, to suggest that the Department's publications are well-tailored to those constituencies they seek to target. Two major problems were identified, namely, "readability" and "timeliness of receipt". These problems should be given further attention to ensure that the cost-effectiveness of the publications programme is not jeopardized. It would also seem useful for the Department to establish a more regular and systematic approach, such as questionnaires in the back of its publications, to ascertain the response of its readership.

III. FELLOWSHIPS, TRAINING AND ADVISORY SERVICES (SUBPROGRAMME 4)

A. Objectives and activities

60. The objective of these activities is to "contribute to the training and specialization of national public officials, particularly those from developing countries, to enable them to participate more effectively in international deliberating and negotiating forums, and also to provide expertise at the national levels" (E/AC.51/1989/5, para. 29).

61. In general, United Nations fellowships are intended for persons already or soon to be entrusted with responsibilities related to their country's development. In the case of disarmament fellowships, candidates are expected to be involved in, or earmarked for, work on disarmament and related matters. 5/ A report on such activity is submitted to the General Assembly each year.

B. Methodology

62. The issues addressed were (a) the adequacy of training programmes and the future direction such activities might take, (b) the extent to which knowledge and training gained were being applied and (c) whether user needs were being met.

63. Questionnaires were sent to sponsoring Governments and to the fellowship holders themselves. The rates of response were 22 and 21 per cent respectively. Annexes V and VI give detailed results of these surveys, which are summarized below.

C. Adequacy of training programmes

1. Sponsoring Governments

64. The programme received a very positive response from Governments. Nine of the 11 Governments that responded stated that the training programme had met their expectations. Seven stated that the training had had "great practical value" and another three that it had had "some practical value". Almost all responding Governments thought the training received by the fellowship holders had contributed "substantially" or "sufficiently" to work on disarmament-related matters. The only issue where more than one respondent stated that the contribution had been "insufficient" was "regional approaches to disarmament".

2. Fellowship holders

65. All nine fellowship holders who responded to the questionnaire considered the overall quality of the training given by the United Nations "satisfactory" or "very good" and seven considered the programme "unique". However, although their response on training quality, organization and content was unanimously positive, it should be noted that five responding fellows chose the term "satisfactory" rather than "very good", to express this view.

66. All components of training, including "lectures" and "study visits", were considered "most useful" or "of some use", except for "simulation exercises", which two respondents considered "not useful". The "research projects" component was rated only "of some use" by five respondents. Such a rating may indicate a problem. Fellowship holders cited "too little time for discussions" as the problem encountered most often, followed by "insufficient practical training".

67. It should be noted that "study visits", the component most favoured by fellowship holders, was recommended for abolition in thir comments by two Governments (see annex V, question 11). A similar discrepancy occurred concerning the "research projects" component, which five fellows found only "of some use" but which was singled out for enhancement in their comments by two government respondents. There would appear to be some difference in viewpoint between nominating Governments and fellowship holders.

D. Extent to which training is applied

1. Sponsoring Governments

68. Despite the responses of sponsoring Governments indicating both that most returning fellows had been given "new or higher level responsibilities" following training and, among a majority of the respondents, that the fellowship programmes had been of "great practical value", 7 of those 11 respondents also stated that fellowship holders had not introduced colleagues to new approaches acquired in training.

2. Fellowship holders

69. The fellowship holders agreed unanimously that they had "personally applied what they had learned" to their own work, and six of the nine respondents indicated that they had taught what they had learned to colleagues; five also stated that they had introduced new methods in their office work, such as suggestions for establishing department archives on disarmament issues or for taking into account disarmament policies of other countries. Such perceptions understandably differ, to a certain extent, from those of sponsoring Governments.

70. Two thirds of fellowship holders stated that their work was still connected to disarmament-related issues.

E. Capacity of Secretariat to meet needs

71. It seems reasonable to conclude that the fellowship programme has contributed to the practical work of government departments dealing with disarmament matters. With this programme, the Secretariat would appear to be meeting the needs of both sponsoring Governments and fellowship holders. The results indicate that the fellowship programme is viewed favourably by both sponsoring Governments and fellows.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

72. Deliberation and negotiation: The pre-session and in-session servicing of the First Committee and the Conference on Disarmament by the Department for Disarmament Affairs was well regarded by Member States. The evaluation found no significant problems associated with any of the issues examined.

73. Major publications: The Disarmament Yearbook and the Disarmament periodical appear, on the basis of small number of responses to a questionnaire, to be held generally in high regard. Some constituencies of the Department's publications, particularly professionals in academic or research institutes and those in non-governmental organizations, while generally positive, were less so than government agencies. These responses reflect the fact that recurrent publications are tailored to the specific needs of individual constituencies that differ in focus. Given the sensitivity of the issues addressed, it is understandable that the style of the publications cannot always satisfy all readers.

74. Press coverage: On the evidence of an analysis of wire service stories, it would appear that there had been a significant decrease in press coverage of disarmament issues in the period 1987-1990. The proportion of those stories making some reference to the United Nations had increased, however. Such changes were presumably due to the rapid improvement in relationships between East and West during this period. The small number of correspondents who answered the questionnaire rated the overall quality of the assistance they received from the Department for Disarmament Affairs favourably. The World Disarmament Campaign, however, was not considered to be effective by the majority of these respondents.

75. Fellowships and training: Both sponsoring Governments and former fellowship holders considered that the fellowship programme had contributed to the work of government departments dealing with disarmament matters.

76. General observations: The progress report summarized its preliminary observations on the programme as a whole as follows:

> "Member States have used the United Nations as a significant forum for the negotiation of agreements and declarations on disarmament, and are continuing to do so. These negotiations have succeeded in establishing a number of instruments and procedures over the last 20 years. During this period, however, the bulk of the disarmament issues before the General Assembly have remained unresolved. On the evidence of a sample of approximately 25 per cent of the relevant literature, it appears that other external professional peer groups do not make extensive use of the work of the programme, though the press and the general public exhibit a high level of interest in it, and there is a very high degree of participation by non-governmental organizations" (E/AC.51/1989/5, para. 31).

During the two years since the progress report was written, an improved relationship between East and West has resulted in continued progress in negotiations in arms control and disarmament, as well as interest in this issue, particularly on the part of relevant non-governmental organizations. Nevertheless, from the results of the present evaluation it would seem that there is still much to be done to promote informed consideration of and support for arms limitation and disarmament measures.

B. Recommendations

77. As its twenty-seventh session the Committee for Programme and Coordination made the following recommendation:

> "In order to ensure that appropriate decisions and recommendations could be made by the Committee, future evaluation reports should present recommendations in two separate categories, namely, those falling within the purview of the Secretary-General for implementation, including, to the extent possible, an indication of the measures already taken or contemplated by the Secretary-General for implementation, and those requiring consideration, approval or action by intergovernmental bodies." 6/

All recommendations that follow are of the first category.

78. World Disarmament Campaign: The Department for Disarmament Affairs should annex paragraphs 41-43 of the present report to the report on the World Disarmament Campaign to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session.

79. Feedback mechanisms: The Department for Disarmament Affairs should periodically utilize feedback mechanisms, such as questionnaires and interviews, to determine the use being made of those publications and services it provides to its major constituencies and to elicit suggestions for improvements.

80. Publications: The Department for Disarmament Affairs should consider the suggestions on publications emerging from this evaluation and endeavour to improve the programme wherever possible, incorporating any resulting programme changes in future budget proposals. These changes should be without prejudice to the needs of Governments.

81. The Department should also consider adopting some of the detailed suggestions made by those responding to the questionnaires. These suggestions include the following:

(a) A Department focal point to deal with the press on substantive matters along with more "high-profile personalities" connected with United Nations briefings on disarmament, and more attention to regional disarmament efforts;

(b) A list of co-sponsors of the previous year's resolutions to be provided to delegations at the beginning of the General Assembly;

(c) Wider dissemination of the Newsletter, particularly among correspondents, and the addition of an annual index;

(d) Review of the Department's mailing list to delete the names of those not wishing to receive publications and to add the names of those, for example, former fellowship holders, with whom contact can be maintained;

(e) A greater number of regional perspectives in the Disarmament periodical.

82. It is recommended that the Committee for Programme and Coordination take note of the present report. Consequently, a separate report to the Committee for Programme and Coordination reviewing implementation of these recommendations does not appear to be needed.

Notes

1/ United Nations publication (Sales No. E.90.IX.4).

2/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 16 (A/44/16), para. 306.

3/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 16 (A/45/16), part one, paras. 358-361.

4/ Ibid., Supplement No. 1 (A/45/1).

5/ See A/33/305, para. 4.

6/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-second Session, Supplement No. 16 (A/42/16), part one, para. 235 (a).

Responses as of 22 January 1991

Number of questionnaires sent: 159
Number of responses : 47
Response rate : 29.6%

ANNEX I

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF MEMBERS
OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE

The Department for Disarmament Affairs (DDA) is responsible for providing secretariat services for the First Committee of the General Assembly. Such services include provision of background material, the provision of substantive, legal and technical services; as well as follow-up on resolutions and decisions of intergovernmental bodies, as required.

1. Would you agree that the following aspects of the Department's pre-session servicing of your meetings have been satisfactory?

	YES		NO		NOT APPLICABLE		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Timely processing of documentation	42	89.4	2	4.3	3	6.4	-	-
b. Planning and organizational arrangements	47	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-

2. With regard to reports and information provided by the Department, as required by the General Assembly, would you agree, in general, with the following?

	YES		NO		NOT APPLICABLE		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Historical background is useful	45	95.7	-	-	1	2.1	1	2.1
b. Issues are clarified well	41	87.2	2	4.3	3	6.4	1	2.1
c. Analyses are technically sound	40	85.1	2	4.3	3	6.4	2	4.3
d. Information is presented in an objective manner	41	87.2	2	4.3	1	2.1	3	6.4
e. Documentation, including conclusions and recommendations as necessary is used by delegations as common reference for discussions and negotiations	43	91.5	2	4.3	2	4.3	-	-

3. Would you agree that the following aspects of the Department's in-session servicing of your meetings have been satisfactory?

	YES		NO		NOT APPLICABLE		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Advice on procedures and organization of work	39	83.0	5	10.6	2	4.3	1	2.1
b. Substantive advice as required	38	80.9	3	6.4	5	10.6	1	2.1
c. Substantive support to Officers of the Committee	42	89.4	-	-	4	8.5	1	2.1
d. Organizational arrangements	44	93.6	3	6.4	-	-	-	-
e. Facilitating informal consultations	40	85.1	1	2.1	5	10.6	1	2.1
f. Co-ordination of work related to informal working groups	39	83.0	3	6.4	4	8.5	1	2.1
g. Timely preparation and issuance of in-session documents	35	74.5	12	25.5	-	-	-	-

/...

4. In connection with the servicing of the First Committee by the Department, what do you consider to be the major factors that contribute to the success of your deliberations?

The main factors mentioned were: facilitation of informal consultations between delegations; quality of advice, assistance and documentation from staff of DDA; provision of background material, e.g. on precedents or on the results of recent meetings; timely submission of documentation.

5. What measures would you suggest to improve servicing of the First Committee by the Department?

The main measures mentioned were: more time to study documents; more resources for DDA; improve the organization of the Department; more secretarial assistance for delegations; re-arrangement of the committee's agenda in "clusters", like the resolutions; more technical facilities such as photocopying machines and typing facilities closer to meeting rooms; list of co-sponsors of prior year's resolutions to be provided at start of GA;

6. In your view, how effective has the Department been in follow-up action required by the relevant General Assembly decisions and recommendations?

	No.	%
1. Very effective	19	40.4
2. Effective	27	57.4
3. Not very effective	1	2.1
[No answer]	-	-

7. How would you rate the importance of the role of non-governmental organizations as a factor in the outcome of your meetings?

(a) IN YOUR CAPITAL	No.	%	(b) UN HEADQUARTERS	No.	%
1. Very important	8	17.0	1. Very important	12	25.5
2. Fairly important	16	34.0	2. Fairly important	21	44.7
3. Not important	14	29.8	3. Not important	11	23.4
4. Not applicable	9	19.1	4. Not applicable	3	6.4
[No answer]	-	-	[No answer]	-	-

8. Would you like to receive a copy of the evaluation study of the United Nations programme, when completed?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
45	95.7	1	2.1	1	2.1

Responses as of: 22 January 1991

Number of questionnaires sent : 39
Number of responses : 9
Response rate : 23.1%

/

ANNEX II

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF MEMBERS OF
THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

The Department for Disarmament Affairs (DDA) is responsible for providing secretariat services to the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum referred to in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Such services include provision of background material, and the provision of substantive, organizational, legal and technical services; as well as follow-up on decisions of the conference, as required.

1. Would you agree that the following aspects of the Department's pre-session servicing of your meetings have been satisfactory?

	YES		NO		NOT APPLICABLE		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Timely processing of documentation prepared by Governments	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-
b. Planning and organizational arrangements, including substantive advice to the President of the Conference on subjects requiring action at the opening of each annual session	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-

2. With regard to reports and information provided by the Department, as required by members of the Conference, or at the initiative of the Secretariat for the President of the Conference or Chairmen of subsidiary bodies, would you agree, in general, with the following?

	YES		NO		NOT APPLICABLE		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Historical background is useful	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-
b. Issues are clarified well	6	66.7	-	-	2	22.2	1	11.1
c. Analyses are sound	5	55.6	-	-	3	33.3	1	11.1
d. Information is presented in an objective manner	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-
e. Documentation, including conclusions and recommendations as necessary, is used by delegations as a common reference for discussions and negotiations	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-

3. Would you agree that the following aspects of the Department's in-session servicing of your meetings have been satisfactory?

	YES		NO		NOT APPLICABLE		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Advice on procedures and organization of work	9	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
b. Substantive advice as required or initiated by the Secretariat during official meetings or informal consultations	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-

	YES		NO		NOT APPLICABLE		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
c. Substantive support to successive Presidents of the Conference during the annual session, as well as to the Chairmen of six subsidiary bodies	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-
d. Organizational arrangements	9	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
e. Facilitating informal consultations	8	88.9	1	11.1	-	-	-	-
f. Co-ordination of work related to plenary meetings, meetings of subsidiary bodies and informal consultations	8	88.9	-	-	1	11.1	-	-
g. Co-ordination in allocating technical services and resources to the Conference and its subsidiary bodies	9	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
h. Preparation, editing and custody of official records of the Conference including the verbatim records prepared by the substantive Secretariat	9	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
i. Timely preparation and circulation of draft annual reports of the Conference and its six subsidiary bodies	9	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
j. Timely preparation and issuance of the in-session documents	9	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-

4. In connection with the servicing of the Conference by the Department, what do you consider to be the major factors that contribute to your deliberations?

The main factors mentioned were: services mentioned in item 3 above, particularly timely preparation and issuance of documents.

5. What measures would you suggest to improve servicing of the Conference by the Department?

The main measures mentioned were: increased staff in Geneva office, particularly secretaries; improved historical background documents; invitation of outside experts on selected issues; improved indexing and computer access to documents; more timely issuance of documents and working papers in all languages.

6. How would you rate the importance of the role of non-governmental organizations as a factor in the outcome of your meetings?

	(a) IN YOUR CAPITAL			(b) VENUE OF THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT		
		No.	%		No.	%
1.	Very important	2	22.2	Very important	-	-
2.	Fairly important	4	44.4	Fairly important	5	55.6
3.	Not important	2	22.2	Not important	2	22.2
4.	Not applicable	1	11.1	Not applicable	2	22.2

7. Would you like to receive a copy of the evaluation study of the United Nations programme, when completed?

YES		NO	
No.	%	No.	%
9	100.0	-	-

Responses as of: 11 January 1991

Number of questionnaires sent: 346
Number of responses : 71
Response rate : 20.5%

ANNEX III

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF SUBSCRIBERS TO THE DISARMAMENT YEARBOOK AND THE DISARMAMENT PERIODICAL

The purpose of the Disarmament Yearbook (DYB) is to present a review of the main developments and negotiations in the field of arms limitation and disarmament taking place each year, primarily within the framework of the United Nations system; and the purpose of the Disarmament periodical (DP) is to provide information and to serve as a forum for ideas in arms limitation, disarmament and security policy issues.

1. Do you wish to continue receiving the publications?

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Disarmament Yearbook	57	80.3	11	15.5	3	4.2
b. Disarmament periodical	56	78.9	10	14.1	5	7.0

Even if your answer is NO, your response to the questions below would be appreciated.

2. What is your affiliation? (Please check only one category)

	No.	%
1. Government agency	7	9.9
2. Academic/research institution	47	66.2
3. Non-governmental organization	10	14.1
4. Other	6	8.5
[No Answer]	1	1.4

3. Do you think the publications have achieved the purposes stated above?

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Disarmament Yearbook	58	81.7	3	4.2	10	14.1
b. Disarmament periodical	55	77.5	6	8.5	10	14.1

4. Would you consider the publication essential for any collection of literature on disarmament issues ?

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Disarmament Yearbook	56	78.9	4	5.6	11	15.5
b. Disarmament periodical	55	77.5	7	9.9	9	12.7

5. (a) Is the copy you receive seen by others within your organization?

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Disarmament Yearbook	53	74.6	7	9.9	11	15.5
b. Disarmament periodical	55	77.5	6	8.5	10	14.1

(b) If yes, how do you distribute the publication?

	SYSTEMATICALLY		AD-HOC BASIS		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Disarmament Yearbook	27	38.0	22	31.0	22	31.0
b. Disarmament periodical	31	43.7	20	28.2	20	28.2

6. Have you recommended the publication to others?

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Disarmament Yearbook	30	42.3	26	36.6	15	21.1
b. Disarmament periodical	28	39.4	29	40.8	14	19.7

7. What information do you look for in the Disarmament Yearbook? Please check as many possibilities as apply.

	YES		NO/NO ANSWER	
	No.	%	No.	%
a. Overview of activities relating to arms limitation and disarmament in a multilateral framework (General Assembly, Conference on Disarmament, International Atomic Energy Agency)	49	69.0	22	31.0
b. Official views of particular Member States on various issues	33	46.5	38	53.5
c. Emerging trends and developments	46	64.8	25	35.2
d. Historical perspective on issues before the United Nations	33	46.5	38	53.5
e. Data on:				
1. Sponsorship of resolutions	17	23.9	54	76.1
2. Voting patterns	25	35.2	46	64.8
3. Status of multilateral arms regulation and disarmament agreements	34	47.9	37	52.1
4. Other	6	8.5	65	91.5
f. Texts of:				
1. General Assembly resolutions	39	54.9	32	45.1
2. Treaties	42	59.2	29	40.8
3. Concluding documents of special meetings and review conferences	31	43.7	40	56.3
4. Other	3	4.2	68	95.8

8. What information do you look for in the Disarmament periodical? Please check as many possibilities as apply.

	YES		NO/NO ANSWER	
	No.	%	No.	%
a. Signed articles:				
1. Discussion of security and arms limitation and disarmament issues from a wider range of geopolitical perspectives than in most media	42	59.2	29	40.8
2. Information and analysis from diverse specific countries/regions	36	50.7	35	49.3
3. Information and analysis from a multilateral perspective	29	40.8	42	59.2
4. Emerging trends and developments	41	57.7	30	42.3
b. Texts of:				
1. Treaties and agreements	34	47.9	37	52.1
2. Joint statements (e.g. between the Soviet Union and the United States)	27	38.0	44	62.0
3. Declarations (e.g. by States parties to the Warsaw Treaty or to the North Atlantic Treaty)	26	36.6	45	63.4
4. Other	7	9.9	64	90.1
c. Reviews/notices of recent books and articles	35	49.3	36	50.7
d. Chronicle of disarmament events	42	59.2	29	40.8
e. Other	3	4.2	68	95.8

9. Do you consider this material to be (please check as many possibilities as apply):

	DYB						DP					
	YES		NO		NA		YES		NO		NA	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Of help to you in broadening your understanding of a range of views on a given issue	43	60.6	4	5.6	24	33.8	38	53.5	4	5.6	29	40.8
2. Of interest as authoritative source material	51	71.8	3	4.2	17	23.9	38	53.5	6	8.5	27	38.0
3. Of interest as background material for teaching/research	46	64.8	2	2.8	23	32.4	43	60.6	2	2.8	26	36.6

NA = No Answer

10. Have you ever cited the Disarmament Yearbook or the Disarmament periodical in any article or study you have prepared yourself, or do you use these publications more as background reference material?

	CITED						BACKROUND REFERENCE					
	YES		NO		NA		YES		NO		NA	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Disarmament Yearbook	15	21.1	21	29.6	35	49.3	38	53.5	17	23.9	16	22.5
b. Disarment periodical	16	22.5	23	32.4	32	45.1	34	47.9	19	26.8	18	25.4

11. If you have cited either the Disarmament Yearbook or the Disarmament periodical please indicate the publication and year in which the citation appeared.

No precise citations were provided in many cases; some respondents stated that the publications where they cited UN documents had not been published; six precise citations were given.

12. If you have used either publication, for what purposes did you use the information?

	DYB				DP			
	YES		NO/NO ANSWER		YES		NO/NO ANSWER	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. General information	40	56.3	31	43.7	28	39.4	43	60.6
2. Speech/lecture	20	28.2	51	71.8	14	19.7	57	80.3
3. Background/briefing notes, etc.	21	29.6	50	70.4	16	22.5	55	77.5
4. Other	13	18.3	58	81.7	10	14.1	61	85.9

13. How would you rate the two publications, in comparison with other publications you receive regularly or read on disarmament issues?

	DISARMAMENT YEARBOOK								DISARMAMENT PERIODICAL							
	V. GOOD		ADEQUATE		INADEQ.		NA		V.GOOD		ADEQUATE		INADEQ.		NA	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Structure	27/38.0		24/33.8		-	-	20/28.2		24/33.8		25/35.2		-	-	22/31.0	
2. Readability	19/26.8		31/43.7		1/	1.4	20/28.2		25/35.2		25/35.2		1/	1.4	20/28.2	
3. Timeliness of receipt	12/16.4		26/36.6		13/18.3		20/28.2		17/23.9		22/31.0		11/15.5		21/29.6	
4. Wealth of information	27/38.0		20/28.2		2/	2.8	22/31.0		23/32.4		22/31.0		3/	4.2	23/32.4	
5. Objectivity /balance	19/26.8		24/33.8		1/	1.4	27/38.0		13/18.3		29/40.8		1/	1.4	28/39.4	
6. Technical accuracy	26/36.6		17/23.9		1/	1.4	27/38.0		16/22.5		25/35.2		2/	2.8	28/39.4	
7. Overall quality	21/29.6		27/38.0		-		23/32.4		17/23.9		31/43.7		-	-	23/32.4	

V. GOOD = Very Good
INADEQ = Inadequate
NA = No Answer

14. How can the publication better meet your needs (in terms of, e.g. focus, coverage, etc.)?

Disarmament Yearbook:

The main suggestions were: more rapid publication and delivery; coverage of a broader range of issues, including the political economy of disarmament; more of a reference book, with statistics, texts, a chronology, future agendas and a more thorough analysis of dissenting opinion.

Disarmament periodical:

The main suggestions were: the articles should have greater analytical depth and be longer and less narrative; more regional perspectives; more focus on the positions of Third World countries with regard to disarmament; a concise coverage of recent developments and issues a little more than a chronology, but same structure; inclusion of documents on various disarmament negotiations.

15. If you have views on any other publications or information materials you receive from the United Nations on arms limitation and disarmament issues, please elaborate:

One respondent stated: the studies series and Disarmament Facts were very useful; the Newsletter needs an annual index. Another stated that the Fact sheets were useful.

Responses as of: 11 January 1991

Number of questionnaires sent: 117
Number of responses : 13
Response rate : 11.1 %

ANNEX IV

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF
UNITED NATIONS CORRESPONDENTS

1. Main areas of interest (Please check as many as apply):

	YES		NO/NO ANSWER	
	No.	%	No.	%
a. First Committee meetings on Disarmament	7	53.8	6	46.2
b. The Disarmament Commission meetings	2	15.4	11	84.6
c. Preparatory Committee meetings	2	15.4	11	84.6
d. Conference on Disarmament meetings	4	30.8	9	69.2
e. Other	3	23.1	10	76.9

2. Have you filed stories where the main focus was on:

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Confidence and security-building measures	5	38.5	-	-	9	61.5
b. Cessation of all nuclear test explosions	8	61.5	-	-	5	38.5
c. Nuclear non-proliferation	5	38.5	2	15.4	6	46.2
d. Regional disarmament measures	6	46.2	2	15.4	5	38.5
e. Chemical and bacteriological weapons	6	46.2	-	-	7	53.8
f. Prevention of an arms race in outer space	3	23.1	3	23.1	7	53.8
g. Conventional weapons	6	46.2	1	7.7	6	46.2
h. International arms transfers	4	30.8	2	15.4	7	53.8
i. Naval armaments and disarmament	3	23.1	3	23.1	7	53.8
j. Reduction of military expenditures	6	46.2	1	7.7	6	46.2
k. Conversion from military to civilian production	4	30.8	2	15.4	7	53.8
l. Disarmament and development	7	53.8	1	7.7	5	38.5
m. World disarmament campaign	4	30.8	2	15.4	7	53.8
n. Other*	3	23.1	1	7.7	9	69.2

* Nuclear free zones were mentioned by two respondents

3. What proportion of the stories you have filed on disarmament matters were published or broadcast?

LESS THAN 50%		50% OR MORE		NOT APPLICABLE		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5	38.5	4	30.8	1	7.7	3	23.1

4. In your opinion, are United Nations activities in the field of disarmament of general interest?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
7	53.8	3	23.1	3	23.1

5. Do you think the World Disarmament Campaign has been an effective information programme in:

(a) providing you with information on multilateral disarmament matters?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2	15.4	7	53.8	4	30.8

(b) promoting public interest in arms limitation and disarmament?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2	15.4	6	46.2	5	38.5

6. Have you consulted any publications of the Department for Disarmament Affairs when writing your articles?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
8	61.5	4	30.8	1	7.7

7. Which of the following publications do you KNOW? UTILIZE?

	KNOW? YES		KNOW? NO		KNOW? [NO ANSWER]		UTILIZE? YES		UTILIZE? NO		UTILIZE? [NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Disarmament Yearbook	7	53.8	3	23.1	3	23.1	4	30.8	3	23.1	6	46.2
2. Disarmament periodical	4	30.8	5	38.5	4	30.8	2	15.4	4	30.8	7	53.8
3. Disarmament Facts	4	30.8	6	46.2	3	23.1	1	7.7	5	38.5	7	53.8
4. Disarmament Newsletter	6	46.2	4	30.8	3	23.1	6	46.2	1	7.7	6	46.2
5. Disarmament Times (not UN publication)	3	23.1	6	46.2	4	30.8	3	23.1	3	23.1	7	53.8

8. Compared with other publications on disarmament you might use for your work, how would you rate the United Nations publications listed above:

	EXCELLENT		VERY GOOD		GOOD		ADEQUATE		POOR		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Structure	-	-	1	7.7	2	15.4	-	-	-	-	10	76.9
b. Readability	-	-	2	15.4	1	7.7	2	15.4	-	-	8	61.5
c. Timeliness of receipt	-	-	1	7.7	-	-	2	15.4	1	7.7	9	69.2
d. Wealth of information	1	7.7	1	7.7	3	23.1	-	-	-	-	8	61.5
e. Objectivity/balance	1	7.7	2	15.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	76.9
f. Technical accuracy	2	15.4	1	7.7	1	7.7	-	-	-	-	9	69.2
g. Overall quality	1	7.7	3	23.1	1	7.7	1	7.7	-	-	7	53.8

9. Have you any comments on the content/format of the UN publications listed in question 7 above? Please elaborate:

The main comments were: more on Third World view points, more objective information on armaments;

10. Please assess the overall quality of the assistance you receive from the Department for Disarmament Affairs in providing material for your reporting.

	No.	%
1. EXCELLENT	4	30.8
2. GOOD	4	30.8
3. POOR	-	-
4. HAVE NOT SOUGHT ASSISTANCE	4	30.8
[No Answer]	1	7.7

11. Do you have any suggestions for enhancing media coverage on United Nations activities in the field of disarmament? Please specify:

The main perceived needs were: more high profile personalities connected with these efforts; more up-to-date data; a focal point in the Department to deal with the press on substantive matters; more briefings; more on regional disarmament efforts.

12. What issues and data in the field of arms limitation, disarmament and international security would you like to see covered more fully in United Nations publications? Please specify:

The main perceived need was for concrete information such as a directory of arms makers by name and country, a list of buyers, the amount of arms manufactured in the world (country by country); more discussion of "multilateral UN military efforts".

13. Would you be available for an interview to discuss your responses?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4	30.8	7	53.8	2	15.4

Responses as of: 22 January 1991

Number of questionnaires sent: 49
Number of responses : 11
Response rate : 22.4 %

ANNEX V

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF GOVERNMENTS
SPONSORING FELLOWSHIP HOLDERS

The purpose of the disarmament fellowship programme, conducted by the Department for Disarmament Affairs, is to promote expertise in disarmament issues, particularly in the developing countries.

1. Did the fellowship training meet your expectations as the sponsoring Government?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
9	81.8	1	9.1	1	9.1

2. If NO, please comment on the reasons for your answer:

"The person who received the training did not have the qualifications needed for my government to really profit from this training"

3. How would you rate the practical value of the knowledge acquired by the fellowship-holder for your Government?

	No.	%
1. Great practical value	7	63.6
2. Some practical value	3	27.3
3. No discernible practical value	-	-
4. Difficult to say; don't know	1	9.1

4. In light of the training received by the fellowship holder, to what extent has the fellowship contributed to the work of your Government in disarmament-related matters?

	SUBSTANTIALLY		SUFFICIENTLY		INSUFFICIENTLY		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Increased understanding of the role of the United Nations in disarmament	5	45.5	5	45.5	1	9.1	-	-
b. Increased understanding of regional approaches to disarmament	6	54.5	3	27.3	2	18.2	-	-

	SUBSTANTIALLY		SUFFICIENTLY		INSUFFICIENTLY		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
c. Increased understanding of national policies	2	18.2	7	63.6	1	9.1	1	9.1
d. Development of negotiation skills through the simulation exercises	4	36.4	5	45.5	1	9.1	1	9.1
e. Increased ability to prepare and draft material on disarmament issues	5	45.5	4	36.4	1	9.1	1	9.1
f. More effective participation in current international disarmament efforts	4	36.4	5	45.5	1	9.1	1	9.1

5. If you answered "Insufficiently" to any of the questions in 4 above, was it because:

	TRAINING DID NOT ADEQUATELY MEET SPECIFIC NEEDS OF GOVERNMENT		DIFFICULT TO ADAPT KNOWLEDGE ACQUIRED TO SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES OF COUNTRY		NO REASON GIVEN	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Increased understanding of the role of the United Nations in disarmament	-	-	1	100	-	-
b. Increased understanding of regional approaches to disarmament	1	50	1	50	-	-
c. Increased understanding of national policies	1	100	-	-	-	-
d. Development of negotiation skills through the simulation exercises	-	-	-	-	1	100
e. Increased ability to prepare and draft material on disarmament issues	1	100	-	-	-	-
f. More effective participation in current international disarmament efforts	-	-	1	100	-	-

6. Did the fellowship holder introduce to colleagues any new approaches, methods, techniques or systems acquired under the fellowship?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3	27.3	7	63.6	1	9.1

7. If YES, please give examples:

The main answer was: fellowship holder helped train others.

8. Has the fellowship holder been given new or higher level of responsibilities since the training?

YES		NO		NO ANSWER	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
8	72.7	2	18.2	1	9.1

9. If YES to question 8, please elaborate.

The main answers were: promotion in, or transfer to, areas of work dealing with disarmament and security issues; assignments to represent the Government in connection with disarmament-related meetings.

10. How would you compare the kind of training given under the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme with the training given by universities or other institutions?

	No.	%
1. Unique	9	81.8
2. About the same	-	-
3. Don't know	1	9.1
[No Answer]	1	9.1

11. What suggestions do you have for enhancing the impact of the United Nations disarmament fellowship programme on the work of your Government in disarmament issues (please specify):

The main suggestions were: increase the number of fellowships; more intensive training, theoretical as well as practical, and within present resources; increased attendance at United Nations meetings on disarmament; more disarmament research projects; abolition of "study visits"; more emphasis on regional disarmament; assign fellows to delegations in First Committee or Conference; entrance exam, final exam and certificate.

12. Would you like to receive a copy of the evaluation study of the United Nations disarmament programme, when completed?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
11	100.0	-	-	-	-

Responses as of 22 January 1991

Number of questionnaires sent: 49
Number of responses : 9
Response rate : 18.4%

ANNEX VI

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF FELLOWSHIP HOLDERS

The purpose of the disarmament fellowship programme, conducted by the Department for Disarmament Affairs, is to promote expertise in disarmament issues, particularly in the developing countries.

1. How would you compare the kind of training given under the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme with the training given by universities or other institutions?

	No.	%
1. Unique	7	77.8
2. About the same	1	11.1
3. Don't know	1	11.1

2. Please rate the overall quality of the organization and content of the training you received under the fellowship:

VERY GOOD		SATISFACTORY		INADEQUATE		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4	44.4	5	55.6	-	-	-	-

3. How useful for your subsequent work was the knowledge acquired under the following components of the the training:

	MOST USEFUL		OF SOME USE		NOT USEFUL		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. Lectures	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
b. Seminars	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-	-	-
c. Research projects	4	44.4	5	55.6	-	-	-	-
d. Simulation exercises	5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2	-	-
e. Study visits	8	88.9	1	11.1	-	-	-	-
f. Attendance at meetings of the deliberative and negotiating bodies	7	77.8	2	22.2	-	-	-	-
g. Interaction with Department for Disarmament Affairs	5	55.6	4	44.4	-	-	-	-

/...

4. Did you face any of the following problems during your training?

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. On the whole the subject areas were too complex	-	-	9	100.0	-	-
b. Too much emphasis on theoretical aspects	2	22.2	7	77.8	-	-
c. Too many lectures	3	33.3	6	66.7	-	-
d. Too little time for discussions	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-
e. Inadequate reading materials	1	11.1	8	88.9	-	-
f. Difficulties with the teaching language	1	11.1	8	88.9	-	-
g. Insufficient practical training	5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1
h. Other problems	2	22.2	2	22.2	5	55.6

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5. After your fellowship, did you:						
a. Personally apply what you had learned to your own work?	9	100.0	-	-	-	-
b. Teach what you had learned to your colleagues?	6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-
c. Introduce any new approaches, methods, techniques learned during your fellowship to the work in your office?	5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1

6. If what you had learned was not adequately utilized or did not significantly contribute to the improvement of the work in your office, was it because:

	YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a. The training did not adequately meet the needs of your work	2	22.2	4	44.4	3	33.3
b. It was difficult to adapt what you had learned to the specific circumstances of your country	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.4
c. Other reasons	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1

7. Is your work still connected with disarmament-related issues?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6	66.7	3	33.3	-	-

If you answered YES, do not answer questions 10 and 11. If you answered NO, do not answer questions 8 and 9.

8. If your work is still connected with disarmament-related issues, how would you describe it compared to what you were doing just before your fellowship?

	No.	%
1. Much the same	1	16.6
2. Differs somewhat	2	33.3
3. Differs considerably	3	50.0

9. If your work is still connected with disarmament-related issues, but your responsibilities are different, was it because of your: (Please check as many possibilities as apply).

	No.	%
a. Increased understanding of disarmament related issues	5	100.0
b. Increased imderstanding of regional and national approaches to disarmament issues	5	100.0
c. Increased ability to prepare and draft material on disarmament issues	5	100.0
d. Enhanced negotiation skills	1	20.0
e. More effective participation in current international disarmament efforts	2	40.0

10. If your work is no longer connected with disarmament-related issues, what kind of work are you doing now?

Different work cited included: analyzing socio-political and economic reports, "military comprehensive planning".

11. Please give the reason why your work is no longer connected with disarmament-related issues.

The main reasons given were: transfer to a different department; posting to a bilateral station with no disarmament issues.

12. Would you say that the fellowship training had a positive effect on your personal career?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
8	88.9	1	11.1	-	-

13. If you answered YES, how did the training have a positive effect on your career?

The main positive effects cited were: fellow came to be regarded as an expert on disarmement issues; did disarmament briefs with more ease.

14. Are you on the mailing list to receive publications or information material issued by the Department for Disarmament Affairs?

YES		NO	
No.	%	No.	%
4	44.4	5	55.6

15. If NO, would you like to be included in the mailing list?

YES		NO	
No.	%	No.	%
5	100	-	-

16. What suggestions do you have for enhancing the impact of the United Nations disarmament fellowship programme on the work of your Government in disarmament issues (please specify):

The main suggestions were: more follow-up contact with United Nations; more theory and discussion; invited lectures by military personnel.

17. Would you like to receive a copy of the evaluation study of the United Nations disarmament programme, when completed?

YES		NO		[NO ANSWER]	
No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
9	100.0	-	-	-	-